

MINUTES
Meeting of the
Ross Advisory Design Review Group

Tuesday, June 16, 2020

Video and audio recording of the meeting is available online at the Town's website at:
townofross.org/meetings.

1. 7:00 p.m. Commencement

Chair Mark Kruttschnitt called the meeting to order. Josepha Buckingham and Mark Fritts were present. Stephen Sutro and Dan Winey was absent. Planning and Building Director Patrick Streeter and Planner Matthew Weintraub representing staff were present.

2. Open Time for Public Comments

No public comments were submitted.

3. Old Business

a. Sweeny Residence – 70 Ivy Drive

Applicant: Imprints Landscape Architecture

Owner: Charlotte & Doug Sweeny

DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval of a Variance and Design Review to construct a new pool measuring 16 feet by 46 feet (736 square feet) and associated coping, a new 7-foot-tall fence, new stone patios, walkways, and stairs, and a new house deck located within the minimum required yard setbacks for an existing single family residence. The proposed project also includes: constructing new low fences and retaining walls; replacing a decomposed granite patio with a new low-water turf area; replacing the existing driveway; installing new landscape plantings; and removing five trees.

The item was previously continued at the June 4, 2020 meeting.

Planner Weintraub introduced the project and summarized public comments received including: 1 written comment stating objection primarily based on concerns about potential privacy impacts (Melinda & Ward Ching at 102 Ivy Drive); and 1 written comment stating objection based on concerns about pool impacts as well as a lack of inclusivity in neighborhood outreach on the part of the applicant (Betty & Jerry Cruse 65 Ivy Drive). Property owner Charlotte Sweeny described the revised project, including background and intent. Landscape Architect Brad Eigsti further described the revised project. Ward Ching at 102 Ivy Drive provided public comment stating objection regarding concerns about potential privacy impacts. ADR Group Members discussed the merits of the project.

ADR Group Members provided the following comments:

Josefa Buckingham:

- Wanted to see more dramatic changes from previous design review on June 4.
- No one is impacted by the front yard setback encroachment because it abuts a street.
- Proposed new pool conforms to the side yard setback and 102 Ivy Drive patio is nonconforming. 70 Ivy Drive has made efforts to minimize impacts.
- Further accommodations would be needed to mitigate pool noise because pools are noisy.
- Prefers to see pool moved 5-8' further to the right (east).
- Recommends flipping orientation of pool and spa so that the spa is further away from 102 Ivy Drive.

Mark Fritts:

- Although he understands Mr. Ching's issues, the side yard setback is conforming. The applicant has moved the pool a significant distance away from the side property line.
- No concerns with the front yard setback encroachment abutting the street.
- Would support moving the spa to the opposite side of the pool for sound mitigation.
- Variances for nonconforming setbacks seem to be needed for many properties not originally designed for pools, with unusual shapes, or steep slopes.

Mark Kruttschnitt:

- Side yard setback adjacent to 102 Ivy Drive is conforming. Front yard setback encroachment is not affecting 102 Ivy Drive. The front yard setback encroachment issue should be considered and decided by the Town Council.
- Would like to see the spa moved to the opposite side of the pool, and the pool moved 10' further to the right (east), to better address privacy and noise concerns.
- The Variance issues begs the design questions; otherwise, design is fine.

Chair Summary:

The design is fine and would not even be a question except for the Variance request, which is subject to the Town Council's approval. Greater consistency with Design Review standards and guidelines may be achieved by implementing the following revisions:

- Move the pool further to the right/east (recommended by Buckingham and Kruttschnitt).
- Move the spa to the opposite side of the pool (recommended unanimously).

The Chair closed the hearing.

4. New Business

a. Stevens Residence – 5 Madera Avenue

Applicant: Stacey N. Ford

Owner: Ann & Chuck Stevens

DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval to construct a new shade structure and new guardrail over an existing house deck within the existing deck footprint. The new open, wood frame shade structure would be approximately 11 feet tall, 15'-8" deep and 26'-7" wide. It would include a partial roof covering of wood louvers over an area measuring 11'-7" by 17'-5", and three panels of adjustable roll-down side screens.

Planner Weintraub introduced the project. Project Architect Stacey N. Ford described the project. No public comments were received. ADR Group Members discussed the merits of the project.

ADR Group Members provided the following comments:

Mark Fritts:

- No particular issues or concerns with the project; will make the deck more usable space.
- Cautions that landscape screening can be removed over time.

Josefa Buckingham:

- No objection to the overall project.
- Recommends no exterior lighting.
- The new structure could be more consistent with the vintage nature of the home.
- Cautions that the deck should not be fully enclosed as a room.

Mark Kruttschnitt:

- No problem with the project.
- Better without lighting.
- Posts should echo the style of the railings.

Chair Summary:

The ADR Group recommends Design Review approval subject to no exterior lighting and maintaining the existing architectural style as much as possible.

The Chair closed the hearing.

b. Tracy Residence – 33 Bolinas Ave

Applicant: Rodgers Architecture

Owner: Tracy Family Trust (Libby Tracy)

DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval to lift the existing two-story single-family residence 5 feet above its existing elevation in its current location, thereby creating a new crawlspace level enclosed in smooth cement plaster beneath the existing home. The project would involve replacing the existing separate front entrances to the first and second stories with a new single-level covered entry porch at the new first floor elevation, and replacing the existing back stairs with new stairs and landings that access both stories at the new floor elevations. The project would also update the fenestration at the first and second stories with new and

modified windows and doors. The project would increase the building height from 24'-3" to 29'-3", while reducing the existing nonconforming floor area.

Planner Weintraub introduced the project. Project Architect Andrew Rodgers described the project. No public comments were received. ADR Group Members discussed the merits of the project.

ADR Group Members provided the following comments:

Mark Fritts:

- Recommends moving rear deck to the east away from western neighbor.
- Recommends noise-mitigating surface on spiral stairs (not metal).
- Supports shifting living spaces to lower level for greater privacy.
- Front elevation is improved; window scale is appropriate; covered side porch is respectful in terms of massing.
- West elevation: overly fenestrated; window height could result in privacy impacts, although lower level living space requires natural illumination; suggests greater consistency in window style at first and second floors.
- East elevation: no particular issues; suggests raised belly-band at first level.
- Advised applicant to consider pursuing FEMA grant for project construction.
- Fully supportive of the project to lift the house out of the flood plain.

Josefa Buckingham:

- Project is an opportunity to correct flaws of existing house, not just lift existing home by 5 feet.
- Suggests reconfiguring shallow roof to have more relief in order to be more compatible with increased building height.
- Recommends shifting the primary architectural elevation and entrance to the front rather than the side; provide more relief to the front elevation.
- Concerned about lifting the large rear deck with respect to neighbors; deck and related activity should be minimized (rear stair is acceptable for egress).
- Prefers that building base be stone veneer or heavily planted, not plain plaster.

Mark Kruttschnitt:

- Fully supportive of raising building out of flood plain.
- Recommends using project as an opportunity to make the building more attractive from the street side.
- Make a front entrance that faces the street.
- Make rear deck smaller.
- Make upper and lower floor windows match.

Chair Summary:

The ADR Group should review a revised project design before making a recommendation to the Town Council.

The Chair continued the hearing.

5. Communications

a. Staff

Director Streeter reported on the June 18, 2020 Town Council meeting agenda; and reported on the upcoming application process for ADR Group membership.

b. Advisory Design Review Group – None.

6. Approval of Minutes

a. May 21, 2020

b. June 4, 2020

The ADR Group Members requested that the June 4, 2020 minutes be revised to include more detail on the comments made by ADR Group Members. The Chair continued approval of the June 4, 2020 minutes.

The ADR Group unanimously approved the May 21, 2020 minutes.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:52 PM.